

**Remarks**

Claims 1-18 are present for examination.

**Claim Objections**

In paragraph 1 of the outstanding Office Action, the examiner has suggested a change to claim 17. This change has been made by way of the instant amendment.

**Rejections Under Section 112**

Claims 6, 9, 12 and 15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. The examiner states that the phrase “said second data and said first data which have been stored in said first memory” have insufficient antecedent basis because the claim previously recites that the second data is stored in a second memory.

The examiner’s comments indicate a misreading of applicant’s Claim 6 which applicant has attempted to prevent by way of insertion of commas in the instant amendment. In other words, the relevant paragraph now reads “wherein said second data, and said first data which have been stored in said first memory, are supplied to said adder in a second period when said second data are written to said second memory.” In other words, the first data is indeed stored in the first memory and has already been stored in the first memory when the second data is simultaneously supplied to the adder and written to the second memory. Thus, the examiner should read the phrase “and said first data which have been stored in said first memory” as modifying only the first data and not the second data. The commas inserted by way of instant amendment are deemed to be sufficient to insure the correct reading of Claim 6.

Applicant’s claims are believed to be in full compliance with the provisions of 35 U.S.C. 112.

**Rejections Under Section 103**

Claims 6, 9, 12 and 15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over Dabak.

The examiner's rejections are respectfully traversed..

It is believed that the examiner's rejection stems from a misunderstanding and misreading of applicant's Claim 6 which has now been corrected by way of amendments made hereto. Under the proper reading of Claim 6, it is clear that there is no disclosure in Dabak of the specific timing of the operations recited therein in particular, wherein said second data, and said first data which have been stored in said first memory, are supplied to said adder in a second period when said second data are written to said second memory." As such, applicant's claims are deemed to be readily differentiated from the prior art and are patentable thereover. Claims 9, 12 and 15 depend directly on Claim 5 and thus include the limitations thereof. These claims are likewise deemed patentable.

The examiner has already indicated that Claims 1-5, 7, 8, 10, 11, 13, 14 and 16-18 are allowable over the prior art. In view of the instant amendment, it is submitted that all of applicant's claims are now allowable.

The application is now believed to be in condition for allowance and an early indication of same is earnestly solicited.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, applicant hereby petitions for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

Respectfully submitted,

Date December 30, 2003

FOLEY & LARDNER  
Customer Number: 22428  
Telephone: (202) 672-5407  
Facsimile: (202) 672-5399

By David A. Blumenthal

David A. Blumenthal  
Attorney for Applicant  
Registration No. 26,257